

Docket No.: A.12-11-009
Exhibit No.: _____
Date: May 17, 2013
Witness: Jeremy Waen

**TESTIMONY OF THE MARIN ENERGY AUTHORITY ON
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY'S APPLICATION FOR
2014 GENERAL RATE CASE PHASE 1**

**APPLICATION OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC
COMPANY (U 39 E), AMONG OTHER THINGS, TO
INCREASE RATES AND CHARGES FOR ELECTRIC AND
GAS SERVICE EFFECTIVE ON JANUARY 1, 2014.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. MEA PROPOSES REVISIONS TO PG&E OVERHEAD ALLOCATION METHODOLOGY TO ENHANCE COMPETITIVELY NEUTRALITY	2
A. CURRENT OVERHEAD ALLOCATION METHODOLOGY ASSIGNS TOO LITTLE OVERHEAD TO THE GENERATION FUNCTION	2
i. <i>PPPs are not inherently monopoly services akin to distribution.....</i>	<i>3</i>
ii. <i>Cross-subsidization occurs if PPP labor is included in distribution labor allocators.....</i>	<i>4</i>
iii. <i>It is anti-competitive to include PPP labor in the non-generation related labor allocators</i>	<i>4</i>
B. THE OVERHEAD ALLOCATION METHODOLOGY SHOULD BE REVISED TO EXCLUDE PPP LABOR FACTORS FROM THE OVERHEAD ALLOCATION	4
III. CUSTOMER RETENTION COSTS SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE RECOVERED FROM SHAREHOLDERS	7
IV. A METHODOLOGY IS NEEDED TO PROPERLY REPAY THE COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE DOE LITIGATION AWARD REGARDING PG&E COSTS DUE TO TEMPORARY STORAGE OF SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL	8
A. PG&E'S PROPOSED METHODOLOGY FOR RETURNING THE DOE LITIGATION PROCEEDS IS OVERLY SIMPLISTIC AND INAPPROPRIATE.....	8
i. <i>DOE litigation awards should offset the costs created by the need for temporary storage of spent nuclear fuel</i>	<i>8</i>
ii. <i>The methodology for returning DOE litigation funds to generation customers must also account for the timing of when customers paid these costs</i>	<i>10</i>
B. DOE LITIGATION PROCEEDS SHOULD BE RETURNED THROUGH A VINTAGED CREDIT METHODOLOGY SIMILAR TO THE POWER CHARGE INDIFFERENCE ADJUSTMENT METHODOLOGY	10
V. CONCLUSION	12

**Testimony of the Marin Energy Authority on
Pacific Gas and Electric Company’s Application for
2014 General Rate Case Phase 1**

I. Introduction

The Marin Energy Authority (“MEA”) is a Community Choice Aggregator (“CCA”) that has been serving customers within the Pacific Gas and Electric Company (“PG&E”) service territory since May 7, 2010. MEA was the first, and is to date the only, operational CCA in California. MEA currently provides electric service to approximately 90,000 retail customers through Marin County and within the next month will be offering service to customers in the City of Richmond, expanding the total number of customers served by MEA to approximately 120,000.¹ MEA is primarily involved in this proceeding to guarantee that its customers are not negatively impacted by the proposed methodologies therein.

MEA customers, like Direct Access (“DA”) customers, are commonly referred to as “unbundled” customers because they opt to no longer receive their generation and distribution electricity services from a single provider, in this case PG&E. MEA’s customers receive their generation services from MEA while remaining subscribed in PG&E’s non-generation related services. PG&E also provides consolidated billing services for MEA customers. PG&E also administers certain programs for which unbundled customers are equally eligible, including California Alternate Rates for Energy (“CARE), some Demand Response (“DR”) programs, and Energy Efficiency (“EE”); however, MEA is also authorized to act as an EE program Administrator for both bundled and unbundled customers within its service territory as of the

¹ Full rollout of the Light Green service to the community of Richmond Ratepayers within the area already eligible to enroll in the program.

1 2013-2014 EE program cycle. ² Because MEA customers receive generation and distribution
2 services from separate entities, shifting of costs from generation to distribution rate componen ts
3 of PG&E’s bundled service can result in inequitable and anti-competitive impacts on MEA and
4 its customers.

5 In this testimony, MEA identifies three issues that adversely impact MEA’s customers.
6 These issues are as follows: 1) the methodology used for allocating PG&E’s overhead expenses
7 to generation and distribution rate components based upon labor factors, needs to be revised to
8 improve its competitive neutrality; 2) Customer Retention costs must remain collected below-
9 the-line from PG&E shareholders; 3) the methodology for the disbursement of Department of
10 Energy (“DOE”) related litigation awards must be revised, to better correlate with past spent
11 nuclear fuel storage costs and to more equitably allocate the benefits to unbundled customers
12 who contributed towards paying these costs.

13 **II. MEA Proposes Revisions to PG&E Overhead Allocation Methodology to Enhance**
14 **Competitively Neutrality**

15 **A. Current Overhead Allocation Methodology Assigns too Little Overhead to**
16 **the Generation Function**

17 Though PG&E has not proposed to modify the methodology used to allocate
18 Administrative and Generation (“A&G”) overhead costs to its Unbundled Cost Categories
19 (“UCC”)³ based upon Operations and Maintenance (“O&M”) labor ratios, ⁴ MEA believes this
20 methodology must be revised to allocate overhead in a more competitively neutral manner.
21 Currently PG&E’s GRC overhead costs are allocated to generation (*i.e.* Electric Generation) and

² Exhibit 1015.

³ The five major UCCs include: Electric Distribution, Gas Distribution, Electric and Gas Transmission (G&T), Gas Storage, and G&E. PG&E does not seek recovery of the labels these UCCs & G&E incur.

⁴ Exhibit 7, PG&E Chapter 7, Section c.

1 distribution (*i.e.* Electric Distribution and Gas Distribution) rate components based upon the ratio
2 of O&M labor factors attributable to each of these distinctly difference services.⁵ Based upon the
3 proposed methodology in the PG&E 2014 GRC Phase 1, labor factors relating to Public Purpose
4 Programs (“PPP”) would be attributed to the distribution UCCs. PPP related labor makes up
5 7.54% of PG&E’s total labor costs. Whether or not PPP and its program components therein are
6 appropriately attributed to the distribution UCCs is left unaddressed by PG&E’s testimony. MEA
7 believes it is improper to assign all PPP related labor costs to the distribution labor allocators
8 because it skews the allocation of PG&E overhead costs to distribution rate components and
9 inappropriately shifts costs to unbundled customers.

10 ***i. PPPs are not inherently monopoly services akin to distribution***

11 The majority of PPP labor costs are attributable to EE-related labor.⁶ According to
12 PG&E’s April 1 Response to MEA Data Request 5, \$63.5 million of the \$86.3 million in PPP
13 labor costs are attributed to EE programs. Put another way, EE labor costs represent 5.55% of
14 PG&E’s total O&M labor costs (compared to 7.54% attributable to all PPP labor). According to
15 this same Response the next largest program, based upon labor costs, was DR costing \$7 million
16 (or .61% of PG&E’s total O&M labor).

17 Provision of EE by PG&E is not a monopoly service akin to distribution. Various entities
18 provide PPP-funded EE programs, including MEA.⁷ PG&E’s role as EE administrator should
19 not in any way subsidize its competitive generation function. Similarly there has been no
20 showing by PG&E that the remainder of the PPPs represented in the total PPP labor factors
21 should be considered monopoly services akin to distribution. Including PPP labor costs in the

⁵ Exhibit PG&E 17 for the complete breakout of O&M labor factors by overhead.

⁶ PG&E Response to MEA Data Request 5.

⁷ PD 15.

1 overhead allocation would effectively subsidize the generation function because it would reduce
2 the share of overhead that would otherwise be allocated to generation. Accordingly, PG&E
3 should exclude PPP labor costs from the overhead allocation.

4 ***ii. Cross-subsidization occurs if PPP labor is included in distribution labor***
5 ***allocators***

6 Including PPP labor factors in the distribution labor allocator will continue to shift
7 overhead costs excessively onto the distribution components of PG&E customers' bills. For
8 bundled customers who receive both generation and distribution services from PG&E, this cost
9 shifting – also known as cross-subsidization – would go largely unnoticed; however, for
10 unbundled customers, such as those who choose to receive generation services from a CCA,
11 these customers would be subsidizing PG&E bundled customers by paying a portion of the
12 generation-related overhead costs through their distribution charges, which PG&E continues to
13 collect from its unbundled customers.

14 ***iii. It is anti-competitive to include PPP labor in the non-generation related***
15 ***labor allocators***

16 In addition to the cross-subsidization of bundled customers' overhead by unbundled
17 customers, including PPP labor costs in the distribution portion of PG&E's UCCs creates an
18 anti-competitive environment for non-IOU Load Serving Entities ("LSE"), such as CCAs and
19 Electric Service Providers ("ESP"). By excessively allocating overhead costs to the non-
20 generation rates of an IOU's service, CCAs and ESPs are forced to compete against a subsidized
21 IOU generation rate.

22 **B. The Overhead Allocation Methodology Should be Revised to Exclude PPP**
23 **Labor Factors From the Overhead Allocation**

24 MEA believes by excluding PPP labor costs from the overhead allocation formula,
25 PG&E's overhead allocation would be more competitively neutral. Because PPPs is not

1 necessarily monopoly functions, PPP labor should be excluded from the overhead allocation so
2 that the competitive generation function is assigned the same share of overhead as would be the
3 case if PG&E did not administer these PPPs. Considering PG&E forecasts its A&G overhead
4 costs to be \$1,166 million dollars,⁸ this shift would mean \$30.7 million dollars less of overhead
5 costs would be collected from the distribution rate and an additional \$22.5 million dollars more
6 would be collected through the generation rate.⁹ (See Tables 1 & 2 for detailed calculations).
7 Though this shift would represent a small amount relative to PG&E's total overhead expenses, it
8 would make PG&E's overhead allocation methodology more competitively neutral.

⁸ Exhibit PG&E 26-

⁹ The remaining \$11.1 million would be collected through the other and Gas Transmission and Storage. This increase in SBGT would be offset by a smaller PG&E Total Labor cost due to the SBGT expansion of the rate base. The net turn represent a net increase in the total labor costs.

1

Table 1: PG&E's O&M Labor Factors by UCC w/ and w/o PPP Labor

<u>Unbundled Cost Category (UCC)</u>	<u>2011 Recorded Adjusted Labor¹⁰</u>		<u>MEA Proposed Labor Factor Methodology by UCC</u>	
	<u>(\$000)</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>(\$000)</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Electric Department</u>				
EG - Power Generation - GRC	271,373	23.70%	271,373	25.63%
EG - Energy Efficiency				
EG - Power Generation - Non-GRC	1,865	0.16%	1,865	0.18%
ET - Network Transmission	70,905	6.19%	70,905	6.70%
ED - Electric Distribution	480,823	41.99%	410,482	38.77%
ED -Electric Distribution (w/o ED-PPP Admin)	410,482	35.85%	410,482	38.77%
ED - Public Purpose Program Administration	70,341	6.14%	-	N.A.
Electric Department Total	824,966	72.04%	754,625	71.27%
<u>Gas Department</u>				
GT - Gas Transmission and Storage	61,963	5.41%	61,963	5.85%
GD - Gas Distribution	258,187	22.55%	242,210	22.88%
GD -Gas Distribution (w/o ED-PPP Admin)	242,210	21.15%	242,210	22.88%
GD - Public Purpose Program Administration	15,977	1.40%	-	N.A.
Gas Department Total	320,150	27.96%	304,173	28.73%
PG&E Total Labor	1,145,116	100.00%	1,058,798	100.00%

2

¹⁰ 2011년 12월 31일 기준

1

Table 2: Changes in A&G Overhead Allocations w/o PPP Labor

A&G Overhead Allocations for 2014

**Total Company 2014 A&G Overhead Expense Forecast
(\$000)**

\$1,166,000

	w/ PPP Labor		w/o PPP Labor		Change in Allocations	
	(\$000)	%	(\$000)	%	Δ (\$000)	Δ %
Distribution	\$752,488	64.54%	\$718,776	61.64%	-\$33,711	2.89%
Generation	\$276,322	23.70%	\$298,849	25.63%	\$22,527	1.93%
Non-GRC	\$137,190	11.77%	\$148,375	12.73%	\$11,184	0.96%

2 **III. Customer Retention Costs Should Continue to be Recovered from Shareholders**

3 MEA agrees with the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (“DRA”) that it is inappropriate
4 for PG&E to recover Customer Retention costs from its ratepayers. ¹¹¹² MEA believes that as a
5 public utility and last-resort generation service provider, PG&E should be neutral to a customer’s
6 choice of generation provider, and PG&E should not engage in Customer Retention activities. If
7 PG&E elects to engage in such activities, ratepayers should not have to pay the cost. Assigning
8 the recovery of Customer Retention costs, which include costs associated with discouraging
9 departure of customers from PG&E bundled service to unbundled service through providers such
10 as CCAs, to PG&E customers would effectively penalize ratepayers for exercising their right to
11 choose where they procure their generation services from. The importance of customer choice is
12 fundamental to MEA’s founding beliefs and functionality. Recovering Customer Retention costs
13 from ratepayers goes fundamentally against a customers’ right to choose. PG&E has been
14 previously directed by the Commission to treat Customer Retention costs in a “bellow-the-line”

¹¹ Exhibit 124, Section 124.5, p. 124

¹² Exhibit 124, Section 124.5, p. 124

1 manner, such that shareholders pay 100% of these costs. ¹³ As with prior GRC cycles, PG&E
2 should be required to treat all Customer Retention costs as below-the-line items paid from PG&E
3 shareholder funds.

4 **IV. A Methodology is Needed to Properly Repay the Costs Associated with the DOE**
5 **Litigation Award regarding PG&E Costs due to Temporary Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel**

6 **A. PG&E’s Proposed Methodology for Returning the DOE Litigation Proceeds**
7 **is Overly Simplistic and Inappropriate**

8 PG&E proposes to credit its electric generation revenue requirement with funds awarded
9 to PG&E as a result of its litigation with the DOE over the federal government’s failure to
10 permanently store spent nuclear fuel created by PG&E’s nuclear facilities. ¹⁴¹⁵ PG&E proposes to
11 amortize the \$340 million in litigation proceeds over the next 3-year GRC period, thus reducing
12 upcoming generation rates rather significantly over this time period. In accordance with the
13 procedures applicable to its DOE Litigation Balancing Account, PG&E must flow through to
14 ratepayers the settlement award, net of litigation costs.¹⁶ MEA believes PG&E’s proposed
15 methodology is flawed for two reasons: 1) it does not properly account for the sources of the
16 costs that these proceeds were intended to offset; and 2) it doesn’t account for the timing over
17 which these costs were incurred.

18 *i. DOE litigation awards should offset the costs created by the need for*
19 *temporary storage of spent nuclear fuel*

20 The costs which PG&E recovered through its litigation effort with the DOE correspond
21 to costs incurred by PG&E while taking the necessary steps to store the spent fuel generated by
22 both its Humboldt Bay Power Plant (“HBPP”) and Diablo Canyon Power Plant (“DCPP”)

¹³ ~~Exhibit PG&E-018~~ ~~Exhibit PG&E-01~~

¹⁴ ~~Exhibit PG&E-018~~

¹⁵ ~~Exhibit PG&E-018~~ ~~Exhibit PG&E-01~~

¹⁶ ~~Exhibit PG&E-018~~ ~~Exhibit PG&E-01~~ ~~Exhibit PG&E-014~~

1 nuclear facilities.¹⁷ The total spent fuel storage costs accumulated by PG&E through the end of
2 2010 amounted to approximately \$266 million.¹⁸ PG&E also predicts that it will incur up to \$20
3 million per year in temporary storage costs for years 2011 through 2013, and the settlement with
4 the DOE allows for PG&E to collect up to that much using an actual cost basis.

5 According to PG&E’s Response to MEA Data Request 4, at least \$131 million of the
6 \$266 million is attributed to DCPD related costs, and at least \$134 million are attributed to HBPP
7 related costs.¹⁹ While most of these costs were covered by PG&E generation customers through
8 their generation rates, PG&E clarifies that at least \$59 million of the HBPP related costs were
9 reimbursed by withdrawals from the HBPP Nuclear Decommissioning Trust (“NDT”). MEA
10 assumes this withdrawal was made to compensate the generation customers that initially bore
11 these costs.

12 In addition to deducting litigation expenses from the settlement proceeds prior to passing
13 through benefit to its ratepayers, MEA believes PG&E should also offset this withdrawal it made
14 from the HBPP NDT before passing through the award to generation customers. Based upon
15 PG&E’s April 8, 2013 Notice of *Ex Parte* Communication with Administrative Law Judge
16 Thomas Pulsifer, it appears that PG&E is revising its DOE litigation credit methodology to
17 something close to this effect. The *Ex Parte* notice reads: “PG&E’s modified proposal is to credit
18 the portion of the proceeds relating to the Humboldt Bay facility to the Nuclear
19 Decommissioning Adjustment Mechanism (NDAM) thereby reducing the NDAM rate.” PG&E
20 has yet to provide more information regarding this ‘modified proposal’.

¹⁷ Exhibit 100-100-100-100

¹⁸ Exhibit 100-100-100-100

¹⁹ PG&E Response to MEA Data Request 4

1 *ii. The methodology for returning DOE litigation funds to generation*
2 *customers must also account for the timing of when customers paid these costs*

3 MEA is concerned that PG&E’s proposal to return the DOE litigation proceeds as a flat
4 reduction to generation rates will not properly account for the timing of when generation
5 customers contributed towards these costs. The standard licensing agreement that PG&E has
6 signed with the DOE for its nuclear facilities provides that the DOE would have a permanent
7 repository for spent nuclear fuel as of January 31, 1998.²⁰ The DOE has yet to establish such a
8 repository, thus the costs that PG&E is seeking to recover through this litigation have been
9 accumulating for over 15 years now.

10 Since PG&E has been recovering these temporary storage costs through its generation
11 rate, PG&E’s bundled generation customers have been paying these costs over the entirety of
12 that 15-year time period. Since 1998, many customers have departed from PG&E’s generation
13 services either initially due to DA or more recently due to CCA. Customers that have more
14 recently departed from PG&E’s generation service should still be eligible to receive a share of
15 the litigation credit that corresponds to their past contributions as a bundled generation customer.
16 MEA believes that a vintaged return methodology of DOE litigation credits should be devised so
17 that unbundled customers, who previously contributed to these costs while subscribing to
18 bundled service, are also fairly compensated.

19 **B. DOE Litigation Proceeds Should be Returned Through a Vintaged Credit**
20 **Methodology Similar to the Power Charge Indifference Adjustment Methodology**

21 MEA suggests that PG&E develop a vintaged methodology to return DOE litigation
22 credits to generation customers based upon the years during which these customers contributed
23 towards these temporary spent fuel storage costs. Similar to the vintaging methodology already

²⁰ [Exhibit 30](#)

1 employed by PG&E for the Power Charge Indifference Adjustment (“PCIA”),²¹ PG&E could
2 leverage this same vintaging system, to assign credits to current and previous bundled generation
3 customers based upon their contributions to these temporary storage costs over the period during
4 which these costs were recovered (1998 through present). These credits could either be based on
5 an actual annual cost basis corresponding with the collections taken from generation customers
6 each year since 1998, or these credits could be allocated using an average annual cost basis
7 derived by dividing the total collected costs by the total collection period. MEA, at this time,
8 does not have a preference on how these credit values are determined provided they are passed
9 through on a fair, vintaged basis to current and previous bundled generation customers.

10 However, MEA proposes the following methodology for refunding the DOE refunds on a
11 vintaged basis to reflect the inter-temporal payment of the storage costs by bundled and formerly
12 bundled customers, which MEA believes would be most fair and straightforward. The DOE
13 refunds would first be allocated to each year, starting with 1998, in proportion to the temporary
14 storage costs recovered in generation rates. A per KWh credit would be calculated for each year
15 by dividing the allocated DOE refund by the total PG&E kWh sales (bundled and unbundled) for
16 that year. The credits would be applied to unbundled customers on a vintaged basis, established
17 by the date of departure from bundled service, using the same vintaging criteria as used for
18 application of the PCIA. An unbundled customer would receive credits associated with all of the
19 years prior to the vintaged departure date because it would have paid all of the storage costs
20 during those years as a bundled customer. For example, a customer departing in May of 2013

²¹ The PCIA is a vintaged fee applied to departing load customers associated with power contracts entered into by PG&E prior to their departure each customer that departs PG&E’s bundled service receives a vintage leave. PG&E then determines an average above trend cost of these departing load customers with the appropriate vintage through fixed proposal here, PG&E already keeps a database of departing load customer

1 would receive a 2012 vintaged credit that would equal the sum of each of the annual per kWh
2 credits from 1998 through 2012. This vintaged credit would be applied to the customer's bill for
3 a one-year period. Bundled customers would receive the credit through a reduction in generation
4 rates for their share of the DOE refund. The bundled customer share would be determined by
5 adding the annual per KWh credits for all years and applying this total credit based on bundled
6 customer KWh sales. The bundled customer credit could be returned over three years as
7 proposed by PG&E.

8 **V. Conclusion**

9 MEA believes PG&E's proposals for the 2014 General Rate Case should be modified in
10 three ways to improve the competitive neutrality of the overall Application. (i) PG&E should
11 exclude PPP labor factors from the allocation of A&G overhead expenditures so that overhead
12 expenditures are allocated in a more competitively neutral manner. (ii) PG&E should continue to
13 recover Customer Retention costs below-the-line from its Shareholders. (iii) PG&E should return
14 DOE litigation proceeds corresponding to temporary spent nuclear fuel costs through a vintaged
15 approach that accounts for contributing ratepayers that have since left PG&E's bundled services.
16 MEA believes that all three of these recommendations are reasonable and easily actionable.
17 Furthermore, all three of these recommendations would allow PG&E to implement its 2014 GRC
18 Phase 1 in a considerably more competitively neutral manner than initially proposed.

꺆꺆꺆

Attachment 1:

MEA Data Request 4 and Corresponding PG&E Responses

꺆꺆꺆

A.12-11-009
PG&E 2014 General Rate Case
Marin Energy Authority Data Request 4
March 13, 2013

Date for Objections: March 20, 2013

Response Due Date: March 27, 2013

TO: Steven W. Frank
Law Department
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
Post Office Box 7442
San Francisco, California 94120
Telephone: (415) 973-6976
SWF5@pge.com
and
GRC 2014 Mailbox
GRC2014Mailbox@pge.com

FROM: Jeremy Waen
Regulatory Analyst
Marin Energy Authority
781 Lincoln Avenue, Suite 320
San Rafael, CA 94901
Office: (415) 464-6027
jwaen@marinenergy.com

Elizabeth Kelly
Legal Director
Marin Energy Authority
781 Lincoln Avenue, Suite 320
San Rafael, CA 94901
Office: (415) 464-6022
ekelly@marinenergy.com

꠆꠆꠆

Follow-up Regarding Exhibit PG&E-6 Chapters 3 and 6 Energy Supply Ratemaking

The following questions are in regard to PG&E's litigation with the Department of Energy (DOE) detailed in both Chapters 3 and 6 of PG&E Exhibit 6.

1. Please briefly explain the mechanics of the DOE charge (for permanent storage of spent nuclear fuel) and what caused the resulting litigation. For example, were the DOE funds collected by PG&E held until DOE was to receive the spent nuclear fuel? Or was this a pass-through to DOE?
2. What was the total dollar amount collected via this DOE charge for permanent storage of spent nuclear fuel from ratepayers for each year since the charge was first collected from ratepayers?
3. During this period of time (i.e. the scope of PG&E's litigation), what were the costs incurred by PG&E related to this litigation?
 - a. What were the total legal costs incurred by PG&E relating to this litigation?

- b. What were the storage costs for spent nuclear fuel that were incurred by PG&E due the DOE's failure to take the spent nuclear fuel?
 - c. What were the Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI) costs incurred due the DOE failing to transfer and permanently store PG&E's spent nuclear fuel? Are there other costs included in the ISFSI?
 - d. Are there other relevant costs that PG&E incurred?
4. Please explain where the costs outlined in Question 3 were recovered from (i.e. the source of funds, such as a balancing account) and whether those costs/sources of funds were from generation or distribution ratepayers, or some other source. For example, from which ratepayers are ISFSI related costs recovered?
 5. Please explain the relationship between the funds held in Nuclear Decommissioning Trust, funds spent on ISFSI, and the funds collected for DOE permanent storage costs.

END OF REQUEST

INSTRUCTIONS

The following General Instructions apply to each data request:

1. In response to each data request, provide all relevant and responsive information reasonably available to the Pacific Gas & Electric Company ("PG&E").
 2. If any of the information sought in a data request will not be available by the response date for that request, state the projected date on which such information will become available.
 3. Each written response or objection should designate the specific data request and data request item under which it is being provided.
 4. Identify each person who provided information used in answering each data request. Such information shall include the full name, occupation, title, employer and organization for each such person, and indicate the information provided by each.
 5. Please include in your production all exhibits appended to or referenced in the requested analyses, testimony, discovery or presentation.
 6. Thank you.
-

**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
2014 General Rate Case Phase I
Application 12-11-009
Data Response**

PG&E Data Request No.:	MEA_004-01		
PG&E File Name:	GRC2014-Ph-I_DR_MEA_004-Q01		
Request Date:	March 13, 2013	Requester DR No.:	004
Date Sent:	March 15, 2013	Requesting Party:	Marin Energy Authority
PG&E Witness:	Joseph O'Flanagan	Requester:	Jeremy Waen

SUBJECT: FOLLOW-UP REGARDING EXHIBIT PG&E-6 CHAPTERS 3 AND 6 ENERGY SUPPLY RATEMAKING

QUESTION 1

Please briefly explain the mechanics of the DOE charge (for permanent storage of spent nuclear fuel) and what caused the resulting litigation. For example, were the DOE funds collected by PG&E held until DOE was to receive the spent nuclear fuel? Or was this a pass-through to DOE?

ANSWER 1

The DOE charge as specified in PG&E's spent fuel contracts was 1 mill (one tenth of one cent)/kW-hour. It was derived based upon the kilowatt-hour production at PG&E's nuclear power plants and included in the costs recovered from customers in the generation portion of PG&E's revenue requirement. The funds collected were remitted to DOE periodically on an as-collected basis; the funds were not held by PG&E.

**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
2014 General Rate Case Phase I
Application 12-11-009
Data Response**

PG&E Data Request No.:	MEA_004-02		
PG&E File Name:	GRC2014-Ph-I_DR_MEA_004-Q02		
Request Date:	March 13, 2013	Requester DR No.:	004
Date Sent:	March 15, 2013	Requesting Party:	Marin Energy Authority
PG&E Witness:	Joseph O'Flanagan	Requester:	Jeremy Waen

SUBJECT: FOLLOW-UP REGARDING EXHIBIT PG&E-6 CHAPTERS 3 AND 6 ENERGY SUPPLY RATEMAKING

QUESTION 2

What was the total dollar amount collected via this DOE charge for permanent storage of spent nuclear fuel from ratepayers for each year since the charge was first collected from ratepayers?

ANSWER 2

As of 3/15/2013 PG&E has remitted \$426,620,545.56 to DOE for their Nuclear Waste Fund. See Attachment GRC2014-Ph-I_DR_MEA_004-Q04Atch01 for details.



Department of Energy

Consolidated Accounting & Investment System

Detail History Report

Nuclear Waste Fund

Reporting 4/1/1983 thru 3/15/2013

Total Received for NE44402 : 426,620,545.56



Department of Energy
Consolidated Accounting & Investment System

Detail History Report

Nuclear Waste Fund

Reporting 4/1/1983 thru 3/15/2013

Company Name/Address	AKA	Contract Number		
Pacific Gas and Electric Company		NE44402		
Mail Code 104/6/6				
P.O. Box 56				
Avila Beach, CA 93424				
Rentor name	Reactor Number	Station		Total Received
Diablo Canyon 1	3501	Diablo Canyon		211,734,329.18

Collections Detail

CashDate	Adj	Transtype(CashType)	BackDate	Amount
2/28/1985		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		287,400.00
5/30/1985		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		769,413.00
8/30/1985		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,160,556.00
11/29/1985		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,228,831.00
2/28/1986		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,844,776.00
5/30/1986		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,114,781.00
8/29/1986		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,053,112.00
11/28/1986		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		381,705.00
2/27/1987		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		309,463.00
5/29/1987		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,167,660.00
8/31/1987		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,237,430.00
11/30/1987		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,227,706.00
2/29/1988		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,974,485.00
5/31/1988		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		621,952.00
8/31/1988		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		242,544.00
11/30/1988		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,210,547.00
2/28/1989		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,305,767.00
5/31/1989		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,173,568.00
8/31/1989		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,345,257.00
11/30/1989		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,680,727.00
2/28/1990		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,015,703.00
5/31/1990		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,218,282.00
8/31/1990		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,053,484.00
11/30/1990		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,334,488.00
3/4/1991		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,082,497.00
5/31/1991		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		499,517.00
8/30/1991		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,270,845.00
11/29/1991		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,330,992.00
2/28/1992		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,082,893.00
5/29/1992		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,957,790.74
8/31/1992		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,137,828.00
11/30/1992		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		932,436.00

Print Date: 3/15/2013 7:18:39 AM

Page 5 of 18



Department of Energy
Consolidated Accounting & Investment System

Detail History Report
Nuclear Waste Fund

Reporting 4/1/1983 thru 3/15/2013

2/26/1993	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,851,174.00
5/28/1993	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,977,345.00
8/31/1993	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,110,468.00
11/30/1993	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,141,587.00
2/28/1994	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,964,233.00
5/31/1994	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		927,494.00
8/31/1994	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,603,051.00
11/30/1994	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,210,581.00
2/28/1995	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,056,797.00
5/31/1995	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,053,329.00
8/31/1995	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,161,712.00
6/19/1991	KWH Penalty Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	2/28/1991	1,116.35
8/31/1988	KWH Interest Payment (Credit, Gross/Net)		-25,383.23
8/31/1992	KWH Interest Payment (Credit, Gen/Sold -		-83,324.03
2/26/1993	KWH Interest Payment (Credit, Gen/Sold -		-443,107.94
11/30/1993	KWH Interest Payment (Credit, Gen/Sold -		-186,495.21
2/28/1994	KWH Interest Payment (Credit, Gen/Sold -		-349,266.48
11/30/1994	KWH Interest Payment (Credit, Gen/Sold -		-224,694.18
8/29/1986	KWH Payment (Credit, Gross/Net - Payable)		-345,530.00
8/31/1992	KWH Payment (Credit, Gen/Sold - Payable)		-306,358.82
11/30/1992	KWH Payment (Credit, Gen/Sold - Payable)		-1,271,684.33
2/26/1993	KWH Payment (Credit, Gen/Sold - Payable)		-357,497.98
11/30/1993	KWH Payment (Credit, Gen/Sold - Payable)		-1,969,843.86
11/30/1994	KWH Payment (Credit, Gen/Sold - Payable)		-37,457.01
11/30/1995	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,329,230.00
2/27/1987	KWH Payment (Credit - Payable)	11/28/1986	-138.00
2/28/1990	KWH Payment (Credit - Payable)	11/30/1989	-6.00
8/31/1994	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	5/29/1992	502.51
2/29/1996	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,225,516.00
11/30/1987	KWH Receipt (Wire, Gross/Net - Receivable)		36,723.00
5/31/1996	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,012,876.00
8/30/1996	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,099,188.00
11/27/1996	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,036,198.00
2/28/1997	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,966,831.00
5/30/1997	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,803,324.00
8/29/1997	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,336,349.00
11/25/1997	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,136,333.00
2/27/1998	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,141,179.00
5/29/1998	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,086,785.00
8/31/1998	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,148,509.00
11/30/1998	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,060,002.00
2/26/1999	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,896,299.00
5/28/1999	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,239,481.00
8/31/1999	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,310,863.00
12/1/1999	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	11/30/1999	2,136,156.04
2/29/2000	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,214,696.15
5/31/2000	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,087,636.66

Print Date: 3/15/2013 7:18:39 AM

Page 6 of 18



Department of Energy
Consolidated Accounting & Investment System

Detail History Report
Nuclear Waste Fund

Reporting 4/1/1983 thru 3/15/2013

8/31/2000	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,807,636.83
2/26/2001	KWH Penalty Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	11/30/1999	579.31
11/30/2000	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,586,970.67
2/28/2001	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,581,115.87
5/31/2001	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		613,277.72
4/29/2004	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	5/31/2001	1,688,216.58
8/31/2001	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,350,890.97
11/30/2001	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,373,172.94
2/28/2002	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,259,481.25
5/31/2002	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,116,201.14
8/30/2002	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,395,080.31
11/27/2002	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,852,549.95
2/28/2003	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,173,834.63
3/25/2003	KWH Penalty Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	5/31/2001	88,101.24
3/25/2003	KWH Penalty Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	5/31/2001	17,829.42
4/30/2003	KWH Penalty Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	5/31/2001	17,838.79
5/30/2003	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,309,956.71
6/10/2003	KWH Penalty Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	5/31/2001	17,441.82
8/29/2003	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,334,029.27
11/26/2003	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,386,296.98
12/22/2003	KWH Penalty Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	5/31/2001	17,838.79
2/27/2004	KWH Penalty Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	5/31/2001	17,838.79
2/27/2004	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,315,678.16
4/29/2004	KWH Penalty Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	5/31/2001	17,644.88
4/29/2004	KWH Penalty Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	5/31/2001	19,917.12
5/28/2004	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,091,477.96
8/31/2004	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,100,133.85
11/30/2004	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,247,569.61
2/28/2005	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,221,970.20
5/31/2005	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,214,748.16
8/31/2005	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,339,959.47
11/30/2005	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,085,952.21
2/28/2006	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,490,146.19
5/31/2006	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,330,328.53
8/31/2006	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,405,956.64
11/30/2006	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,401,577.71
2/28/2007	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,348,719.66
5/31/2007	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,269,980.50
8/31/2007	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,582,479.73
11/30/2007	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,165,274.04
2/29/2008	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,318,563.93
5/30/2008	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,333,973.45
8/29/2008	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,332,549.00
11/28/2008	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,351,919.98
2/27/2009	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,192,569.60
5/29/2009	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		890,710.57
8/31/2009	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,397,101.58

Print Date: 3/15/2013 7:18:39 AM

Page 7 of 18



Department of Energy

Consolidated Accounting & Investment System

Detail History Report

Nuclear Waste Fund

Reporting 4/1/1983 thru 3/15/2013

12/2/2009	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,213,335.54
3/1/2010	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	2/28/2010	2,331,103.64
5/28/2010	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,277,884.60
9/1/2010	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,421,056.19
11/30/2010	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,638,861.89
2/28/2011	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,030,050.21
5/31/2011	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,293,641.36
8/31/2011	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,378,068.40
11/30/2011	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,268,626.08
2/29/2012	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,380,678.78
5/31/2012	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,136,104.85
8/31/2012	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,114,270.74
11/30/2012	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,436,918.27
2/28/2013	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,323,452.54



Department of Energy
Consolidated Accounting & Investment System

GRC2014-Ph-I_DR_MEA_004-Q02Atch01

Detail History Report
Nuclear Waste Fund

Reporting 4/1/1983 thru 3/15/2013

Company Name/Address	AKA	Contract Number
Pacific Gas and Electric Company		NE44402

Mail Code 104/6/6

P.O. Box 56

Avila Beach, CA 93424

Reactor name	Reactor Number	Station	Total Received
Diablo Canyon 2	3502	Diablo Canyon	209,741,875.49

Collections Detail

CashDate	Adj	Transtypc(CashType)	BackDate	Amount
2/28/2013		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,327,279.79
11/30/2012		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,259,090.81
8/31/2012		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,426,874.51
5/31/2012		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,152,534.46
2/29/2012		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,351,029.30
11/30/2011		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,337,518.68
8/31/2011		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,394,479.66
5/31/2011		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,126,403.14
2/28/2011		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,322,771.74
11/30/2010		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,369,522.44
9/1/2010		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,413,286.84
5/28/2010		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,329,215.96
3/1/2010		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	2/28/2010	2,025,674.04
12/2/2009		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,221,157.95
8/31/2009		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,231,946.87
5/29/2009		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,295,920.97
2/27/2009		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,363,038.47
11/28/2008		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,682,494.44
8/29/2008		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,384,684.21
5/30/2008		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		459,588.36
2/29/2008		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,252,674.20
11/30/2007		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,335,028.84
8/31/2007		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,347,896.93
5/31/2007		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,230,458.70
2/28/2007		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,224,463.67
11/30/2006		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,393,703.83
8/31/2006		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,677,002.87
5/31/2006		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,868,220.65
2/28/2006		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,312,666.27
11/30/2005		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,228,854.27
8/31/2005		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,357,614.25
5/31/2005		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,277,356.74
2/28/2005		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,060,172.57
11/30/2004		KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,009,035.03

Print Date: 3/15/2013 7:18:39 AM

Page 9 of 18



Department of Energy

Consolidated Accounting & Investment System

Detail History Report

Nuclear Waste Fund

Reporting 4/1/1983 thru 3/15/2013

8/31/2004	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,174,977.51
5/28/2004	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,141,983.95
4/29/2004	KWH Penalty Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	5/31/2001	19,136.05
4/29/2004	KWH Penalty Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	5/31/2001	16,952.93
2/27/2004	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,333,621.40
2/27/2004	KWH Penalty Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	5/31/2001	17,139.22
12/22/2003	KWH Penalty Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	5/31/2001	17,139.22
11/26/2003	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,374,282.98
8/29/2003	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,374,820.93
6/16/2003	KWH Penalty Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	5/31/2001	16,775.80
5/30/2003	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		449,914.26
4/30/2003	KWH Penalty Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	5/31/2001	17,139.22
3/25/2003	KWH Penalty Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	5/31/2001	17,148.59
3/25/2003	KWH Penalty Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	5/31/2001	84,737.05
2/28/2003	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,123,707.97
11/27/2002	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,246,443.47
9/20/2002	KWH Penalty Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	8/31/2002	125.15
9/20/2002	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	8/31/2002	24,578.41
8/30/2002	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,192,100.45
5/31/2002	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,120,364.45
2/28/2002	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,254,318.27
11/30/2001	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,330,223.46
8/31/2001	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,584,583.62
4/29/2004	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	5/31/2001	1,623,751.32
5/31/2001	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		589,859.46
2/28/2001	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,069,889.85
11/30/2000	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,892,382.83
2/26/2001	KWH Penalty Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	11/30/1999	428.43
8/31/2000	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,181,618.67
5/31/2000	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,129,235.26
2/29/2000	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,214,458.37
12/1/1999	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	11/30/1999	1,410,112.81
8/31/1999	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,333,024.00
5/28/1999	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,169,757.00
2/26/1999	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,027,273.00
11/30/1998	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,202,745.00
8/31/1998	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,201,518.00
5/29/1998	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,006,854.00
2/27/1998	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,183,465.00
11/25/1997	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,015,263.00
8/29/1997	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,050,070.00
5/30/1997	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,813,851.00
2/28/1997	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,226,723.00
11/27/1996	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,995,577.00
8/30/1996	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,572,296.00
5/31/1996	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,547,820.00
2/29/1988	KWH Receipt (Wire, Gross/Net - Receivable)		2.00

Print Date: 3/15/2013 7:18:39 AM



Department of Energy

Consolidated Accounting & Investment System

Detail History Report

Nuclear Waste Fund

Reporting 4/1/1983 thru 3/15/2013

11/30/1987	KWH Receipt (Wire, Gross/Net - Receivabl		7,633.00
2/29/1996	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,003,263.00
2/28/1989	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	8/31/1988	26,103.00
8/31/1994	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	5/29/1992	509.15
11/30/1995	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,837,989.00
11/30/1994	KWH Payment (Credit, Gen/Sold - Payable)		-33,605.56
11/30/1993	KWH Payment (Credit, Gen/Sold - Payable)		-1,767,298.02
11/30/1992	KWH Payment (Credit, Gen/Sold - Payable)		-1,461,664.42
8/31/1992	KWH Payment (Credit, Gen/Sold - Payable)		-274,858.00
8/29/1986	KWH Payment (Credit, Gross/Net - Payable)		-12,440.00
11/30/1994	KWH Interest Payment (Credit, Gen/Sold -		-186,366.24
11/30/1993	KWH Interest Payment (Credit, Gen/Sold -		-413,896.91
8/31/1992	KWH Interest Payment (Credit, Gen/Sold -		-64,425.11
11/30/1992	KWH Interest Payment (Credit, Gen/Sold -		-342,318.25
8/31/1988	KWH Interest Payment (Credit, Gross/Net		-986.50
6/19/1991	KWH Penalty Receipt (Wire Receipt - Rece	2/28/1991	1,202.32
8/31/1995	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,137,532.00
5/31/1995	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,093,143.00
2/28/1995	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,863,613.00
11/30/1994	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,313,843.00
8/31/1994	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,229,383.00
5/31/1994	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,792,636.00
2/28/1994	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,122,390.00
11/30/1993	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,195,947.00
8/31/1993	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,095,885.00
5/28/1993	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		698,297.00
2/26/1993	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,165,303.00
11/30/1992	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,143,231.00
8/31/1992	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,206,551.00
5/29/1992	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,983,659.21
2/28/1992	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,191,224.00
11/29/1991	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		812,274.00
8/30/1991	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,350,907.00
5/31/1991	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,210,475.00
3/4/1991	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,242,856.00
11/30/1990	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,321,638.00
8/31/1990	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,126,434.00
5/31/1990	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		792,124.00
2/28/1990	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,234,085.00
11/30/1989	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,154,343.00
8/31/1989	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,208,729.00
5/31/1989	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,023,109.00
2/28/1989	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,257,144.00
11/30/1988	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		840,618.00
8/31/1988	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		1,922,426.00
5/31/1988	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,217,651.00
2/29/1988	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)		2,120,351.00

Print Date: 3/15/2013 7:18:39 AM

Page 11 of 18



Department of Energy

Consolidated Accounting & Investment System

Detail History Report

Nuclear Waste Fund

Reporting 4/1/1983 thru 3/15/2013

11/30/1987	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	2,359,127.00
8/31/1987	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	171,387.00
5/29/1987	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	1,103,914.00
2/27/1987	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	2,243,487.00
11/28/1986	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	2,119,691.00
8/29/1986	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	1,856,974.00
5/30/1986	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	1,331,873.00
2/28/1986	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	678,030.00
11/29/1985	KWH Receipt (Wire Receipt - Receivable)	50,900.00



Department of Energy

Consolidated Accounting & Investment System

Detail History Report
Nuclear Waste Fund

Reporting 4/1/1983 thru 3/15/2013

Company Name/Address	AKA	Contract Number		
Pacific Gas and Electric Company		NE44402		
Mail Code 104/6/6				
P.O. Box 56				
Avila Beach, CA 93424				
Reator name	Reactor Number	Station		Total Received
Humboldt Bay	3503	Humbolt Bay		5,144,340.89

Collections Detail

CashDate	Adj	Transtype(CashType)	BackDate	Amount
6/27/1985		SNF Principal Receipt (Wire Receipt - Rec		3,887,152.32
6/28/1996		SNF Principal Receipt (Wire Receipt - Rec		667,456.63
6/28/1996		SNF Interest Receipt (Wire Receipt - Rec		573,954.47
8/30/1996		SNF Interest Receipt (Wire Receipt - Rec		15,777.47

**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
2014 General Rate Case Phase I
Application 12-11-009
Data Response**

PG&E Data Request No.:	MEA_004-03		
PG&E File Name:	GRC2014-Ph-I_DR_MEA_004-Q03		
Request Date:	March 13, 2013	Requester DR No.:	004
Date Sent:	March 15, 2013	Requesting Party:	Marin Energy Authority
PG&E Witness:	Joseph O'Flanagan	Requester:	Jeremy Waen

SUBJECT: FOLLOW-UP REGARDING EXHIBIT PG&E-6 CHAPTERS 3 AND 6 ENERGY SUPPLY RATEMAKING

QUESTION 3

During this period of time (i.e. the scope of PG&E's litigation), what were the costs incurred by PG&E related to this litigation?

- a. What were the total legal costs incurred by PG&E relating to this litigation?
- b. What were the storage costs for spent nuclear fuel that were incurred by PG&E due the DOE's failure to take the spent nuclear fuel?
- c. What were the Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI) costs incurred due the DOE failing to transfer and permanently store PG&E's spent nuclear fuel? Are there other costs included in the ISFSI?
- d. Are there other relevant costs that PG&E incurred?

ANSWER 3

- a. The Department of Energy Litigation Balancing Account (DOELBA) balance for outside counsel and litigation expense as of 2/28/2013 is \$14.958 million.
- b. The following table is a summary of the costs used to determine the settlement amount of \$266,104,245:

Claim Area	Settlement Amount
DCPP ISFSI	\$ 122,109,083
DCPP Temp Rack	\$ 7,424,854
DCPP Pre-1998 Study	\$ 1,451,091
HBPP SAFSTOR	\$ 74,884,657
HBPP ISFSI	\$ 59,335,043
Off-Site Storage Study	\$ 899,517
Total	\$ 266,104,245

- c. See the answer to subpart b.
- d. All of the reimbursable costs included in the settlement are shown in the response to subpart b.

**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
2014 General Rate Case Phase I
Application 12-11-009
Data Response**

PG&E Data Request No.:	MEA_004-04		
PG&E File Name:	GRC2014-Ph-I_DR_MEA_004-Q04		
Request Date:	March 13, 2013	Requester DR No.:	004
Date Sent:	March 15, 2013	Requesting Party:	Marin Energy Authority
PG&E Witness:	Joseph O'Flanagan	Requester:	Jeremy Waen

SUBJECT: FOLLOW-UP REGARDING EXHIBIT PG&E-6 CHAPTERS 3 AND 6 ENERGY SUPPLY RATEMAKING

QUESTION 4

Please explain where the costs outlined in Question 3 were recovered from (i.e. the source of funds, such as a balancing account) and whether those costs/sources of funds were from generation or distribution ratepayers, or some other source. For example, from which ratepayers are ISFSI related costs recovered?

ANSWER 4

The costs associated with Diablo Canyon were recovered from customers as part of the generation component of PG&E's revenue requirement. The costs associated with HBPP SAFESTOR were recovered from customers as a surcharge in the nuclear decommissioning component of PG&E's revenue requirement. The costs associated with the HBPP ISFSI were reimbursed through draw-downs from the HBPP Decommissioning Trust (which was funded through the nuclear decommissioning component of PG&E's revenue requirement).

**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
2014 General Rate Case Phase I
Application 12-11-009
Data Response**

PG&E Data Request No.:	MEA_004-05		
PG&E File Name:	GRC2014-Ph-I_DR_MEA_004-Q05		
Request Date:	March 13, 2013	Requester DR No.:	004
Date Sent:	March 15, 2013	Requesting Party:	Marin Energy Authority
PG&E Witness:	Joseph O'Flanagan	Requester:	Jeremy Waen

SUBJECT: FOLLOW-UP REGARDING EXHIBIT PG&E-6 CHAPTERS 3 AND 6 ENERGY SUPPLY RATEMAKING

QUESTION 5

Please explain the relationship between the funds held in Nuclear Decommissioning Trust, funds spent on ISFSI, and the funds collected for DOE permanent storage costs.

ANSWER 5

As discussed in the responses to questions 1 and 4 (GRC2014-Ph-I_DR_MEA_004-Q01, Q04), the funds collected by DOE under the spent fuel contracts were recovered from generation customers and are unrelated to the Nuclear Decommissioning Trust Fund. The funds spent on the Diablo Canyon ISFSI were recovered from generation customers and are unrelated to the Nuclear Decommissioning Trust. The funds spent on the HBPP ISFSI were reimbursed through withdrawals from the HBPP Nuclear Decommissioning Trust.

Attachment 2:

MEA Data Request 5 and Corresponding PG&E Responses

A.12-11-009
PG&E 2014 General Rate Case
Marin Energy Authority Data Request 5
March 19, 2013

Date for Objections: March 26, 2013
Response Due Date: April 2, 2013

TO: Steven W. Frank
Law Department
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
Post Office Box 7442
San Francisco, California 94120
Telephone: (415) 973-6976
SWF5@pge.com
and
GRC 2014 Mailbox
GRC2014Mailbox@pge.com

FROM: Jeremy Waen
Regulatory Analyst
Marin Energy Authority
781 Lincoln Avenue, Suite 320
San Rafael, CA 94901
Office: (415) 464-6027
jwaen@marinenergy.com

Elizabeth Kelly
Legal Director
Marin Energy Authority
781 Lincoln Avenue, Suite 320
San Rafael, CA 94901
Office: (415) 464-6022
ekelly@marinenergy.com

꠆꠆꠆

Follow-up Regarding Exhibit PG&E-2 Work Paper 7-11

The following questions are in regard to the table titled “O&M Labor Factors by UCC” and the contents within it.

1. For the line items labeled ED – Public Purpose Program Administration (line 16) and GD – Public Purpose Program Administration (line 24), what are all the programs funded by the PPP charges (e.g. CARE, EE, CSI, etc.)?
 - a. Please provide a delineation of the labor allocators for each of these subprograms as a percentage of the overall PG&E total labor in the answer to the above question.
 - b. For the Energy Efficiency components funded by PPP charges, please provide a delineation of the labor allocators for each of the various EE sub-programs as a percentage of the overall PG&E total labor in the answer to the above question.

END OF REQUEST

INSTRUCTIONS

The following General Instructions apply to each data request:

1. In response to each data request, provide all relevant and responsive information reasonably available to the Pacific Gas & Electric Company (“PG&E”).
 2. If any of the information sought in a data request will not be available by the response date for that request, state the projected date on which such information will become available.
 3. Each written response or objection should designate the specific data request and data request item under which it is being provided.
 4. Identify each person who provided information used in answering each data request. Such information shall include the full name, occupation, title, employer and organization for each such person, and indicate the information provided by each.
 5. Please include in your production all exhibits appended to or referenced in the requested analyses, testimony, discovery or presentation.
 6. Thank you.
-
-

**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
2014 General Rate Case Phase I
Application 12-11-009
Data Response**

PG&E Data Request No.:	MEA_005-01		
PG&E File Name:	GRC2014-Ph-I_DR_MEA_005-Q01		
Request Date:	March 19, 2013	Requester DR No.:	005
Date Sent:	April 1, 2013	Requesting Party:	Marin Energy Authority
PG&E Witness:	David H. Hartman	Requester:	Jeremy Waen

SUBJECT: FOLLOW-UP REGARDING EXHIBIT PG&E-2 WORK PAPER 7-11

QUESTION 1

For the line items labeled ED – Public Purpose Program Administration (line 16) and GD – Public Purpose Program Administration (line 24), what are all the programs funded by the PPP charges (e.g. CARE, EE, CSI, etc.)?

- a. Please provide a delineation of the labor allocators for each of these subprograms as a percentage of the overall PG&E total labor in the answer to the above question.
- b. For the Energy Efficiency components funded by PPP charges, please provide a delineation of the labor allocators for each of the various EE sub-programs as a percentage of the overall PG&E total labor in the answer to the above question.

ANSWER 1

- a. The following table shows the programs that were included in the ED and GD PPP lines of the O&M Labor Allocation Table (WP7-11, line 16 and 24).

Program	2011 Labor (\$000)	% of Total Labor
Customer Energy Efficiency MWCs	63,500	5.55%
LIBA-Low Income (Public Purpose Program)	6,679	0.58%
CARE - Calif. Altern. Rate for Energy	2,748	0.24%
FERA - Family Elect. Rate Assistance	101	0.01%
CSIBA - California Solar Initiative Bal.	3,095	0.27%
CSITPMA - CSI Therm Gas Memo Account	472	0.04%
SGIP - Self Generation Incentive Program	417	0.04%
Demand Response Other	58	0.01%
DREBA - Demand Response Expenditures	7,021	0.61%
ACEBA - Air Conditioning Expenditures	727	0.06%
10/20 Program - Gas 10/20 Program	815	0.07%
Other	685	0.06%
Total	86,318	7.54%

- b. The delineation of sub-programs of Customer Energy Efficiency MWCs appears in attachment GRC2014-Ph-I_DR_MEA_005-Q01Aтч01.

Labor Allocators for EE Programs

program number	program name	Total (\$)	Percentage allocator
EM&V	Evaluation, Measurement & Verification	804,567	0.07%
PGE21001	Home Energy Efficiency Surveys Program	1,079,166	0.09%
PGE21002	Residential Lighting Incentive Program	684,165	0.06%
PGE21003	Advanced Consumer Lighting Program	427,303	0.04%
PGE21004	Home Energy Efficiency Rebates	2,277,578	0.20%
PGE21005	Appliance Recycling Program	553,493	0.05%
PGE21006	Business and Consumer Electronics Progra	941,091	0.08%
PGE21007	Multifamily Energy Efficiency Rebates Pr	448,873	0.04%
PGE21008	Whole House Performance Program (1)	961,345	0.08%
PGE21011	Calculated Incentives	5,585,340	0.49%
PGE21012	Deemed Incentives	4,956,091	0.43%
PGE21013	Continuous Energy Improvement	188,450	0.02%
PGE21014	Nonresidential Audits Program	1,292,705	0.11%
PGE21021	Calculated Incentives	3,607,701	0.32%
PGE21022	Deemed Incentives	1,521,195	0.13%
PGE21023	Continuous Energy Improvement	359,875	0.03%
PGE21024	Nonresidential Audits Program	90,149	0.01%
PGE21031	Calculated Incentives	3,027,549	0.26%
PGE21032	Deemed Incentives	1,381,582	0.12%
PGE21033	Continuous Energy Improvement	251,974	0.02%
PGE21034	Nonresidential Audits Program	90,149	0.01%
PGE21035	Pump Efficiency Services Program	290,870	0.03%
PGE21041	Residential New Construction	1,499,909	0.13%
PGE21042	Savings By Design	3,157,344	0.28%
PGE2105	Lighting Market Transformation	140,322	0.01%
PGE21061	Upstream HVAC Equipment Incentive	412,755	0.04%
PGE21062	HVAC Technologies and System Diagnostics	135,656	0.01%
PGE21063	Commercial Quality Installation	320,276	0.03%
PGE21064	ENERGY STAR Residential Quality Installa	594,946	0.05%
PGE21065	Residential Quality Maintenance and Comm	1,002,959	0.09%
PGE21066	Workforce Education & Training	140,572	0.01%
PGE21071	C&S Advocacy & CASE Studies: Building C	259,558	0.02%
PGE21072	C&S Advocacy & CASE Studies: Appliance S	312,248	0.03%
PGE21073	C&S Compliance Enhancements Training	61,532	0.01%
PGE21074	C&S Coordination (Statewide, EE Programs	92,285	0.01%
PGE21075	C&S REACH Codes	127,702	0.01%
PGE21076	C&S Other	17,970	0.00%
PGE21081	Assessments	1,174,104	0.10%
PGE21082	Scaled Field Placement	6,732	0.00%
PGE21083	Demonstration / Showcasing	6,732	0.00%
PGE21084	Market and Behavioral Studies	26,955	0.00%
PGE21085	Technology Supply Side Efforts	36,959	0.00%
PGE21086	Incubation	7,240	0.00%
PGE21091	WE&T Centergies	1,962,199	0.17%
PGE21092	WE&T Connections	183,456	0.02%
PGE21093	WE&T Strategic Plan Implementation	39,792	0.00%

PGE21101	Statewide Marketing & Outreach	151,333	0.01%
PGE2111	Statewide DSM Coordination & Integration	65,931	0.01%
PGE2112	Zero Net Pilots	315,619	0.03%
PGE21131	Integrated Marketing	169,375	0.01%
PGE21132	Integrated Education & Training	12,837	0.00%
PGE21133	Integrated Sales Training	44,603	0.00%
PGE21134	Integration Support	241,130	0.02%
PGE2114	On-Bill Financing	1,562,803	0.14%
PGE2125	LGEAR	1,001,406	0.09%
PGE21251	Innovator Pilots Program	209,546	0.02%
PGE21252	Green Communities	1,585,776	0.14%
PGE21261	California Community Colleges	(4)	0.00%
PGE21262	California Community Colleges	862,317	0.08%
PGE21263	California Community Colleges	24,136	0.00%
PGE21264	California Community Colleges	198	0.00%
PGE2130	AMBAG Energy Watch	391,654	0.03%
PGE2131	City of San Joaquin Energy Watch	26,065	0.00%
PGE2132	East Bay Energy Watch	765,158	0.07%
PGE2133	Fresno County Energy Watch	316,416	0.03%
PGE2134	Kern County Energy Watch	313,571	0.03%
PGE2135	Madera County Energy Watch	23,176	0.00%
PGE2136	Marin County Energy Watch	160,698	0.01%
PGE2137	Mendocino County Energy Watch	26,065	0.00%
PGE2138	Napa County Energy Watch	67,256	0.01%
PGE2139	Redwood Energy Watch	157,831	0.01%
PGE2140	San Joaquin County Energy Watch	157,834	0.01%
PGE2141	San Luis Obispo County Energy Watch	101,152	0.01%
PGE2142	San Mateo County Energy Watch	184,687	0.02%
PGE2143	Santa Barbara County Energy Watch	103,268	0.01%
PGE2144	Sierra Nevada Energy Watch	263,524	0.02%
PGE2145	Sonoma County Energy Watch	144,865	0.01%
PGE2146	Silicon Valley Energy Watch	527,066	0.05%
PGE2147	San Francisco Energy Watch	632,748	0.06%
PGE2176	California New Homes Multifamily	206,008	0.02%
PGE2177	Enhance Time Delay Relay	99,365	0.01%
PGE2178	ENERGY STAR Manufactured Homes	106,779	0.01%
PGE2179	Direct Install for Manufactured and Mobi	107,784	0.01%
PGE2181	Air Care Plus	122,089	0.01%
PGE2182	Boiler Energy Efficiency Program	456,982	0.04%
PGE2183	Comprehensive Retail Energy Management	157,946	0.01%
PGE2185	EnergySmart Grocer	295,384	0.03%
PGE2186	Enhanced Automation Initiative	70,201	0.01%
PGE2187	Monitoring-Based Persistence Commissioni	82,292	0.01%
PGE2189	Cool Controls Plus	340,305	0.03%
PGE2190	LodgingSavers	266,908	0.02%
PGE2191	Medical Building Tune-Up	100,269	0.01%
PGE2193	School Energy Efficiency	131,699	0.01%
PGE2194	Energy Fitness Program	302,307	0.03%

PGE2195	Energy Savers	131,629	0.01%
PGE2196	RightLights	390,103	0.03%
PGE2197	Small Business Commercial Comprehensive	256,685	0.02%
PGE2198	DCCCP Quest	177,965	0.02%
PGE2199	Energy-Efficient Parking Garage	200,413	0.02%
PGE2200	Furniture Store Energy Efficiency	183,558	0.02%
PGE2201	High Performance Office Lighting	234,044	0.02%
PGE2202	LED Accelerator	222,576	0.02%
PGE2203	Monitoring-Based Commissioning	265,040	0.02%
PGE2204	SmartVent for Energy-Efficient Kitchens	216,365	0.02%
PGE2205	Casino Green	184,244	0.02%
PGE2206	Healthcare Energy Efficiency Program	299,159	0.03%
PGE2209	Ozone Laundry Energy Efficiency	177,097	0.02%
PGE2210	Cool Schools	94,800	0.01%
PGE2212	California Preschool Energy Efficiency P	83,138	0.01%
PGE2213	K-12 Private Schools and Colleges Audit	176,957	0.02%
PGE2214	EE Entertainment Centers	184,830	0.02%
PGE2220	AIM Compressed Air Efficiency	197,191	0.02%
PGE2221	California Wastewater Process Optimizati	116,742	0.01%
PGE2222	Energy Efficiency Services for Oil Produ	588,693	0.05%
PGE2223	Heavy Industry Energy Efficiency Program	613,499	0.05%
PGE2224	Industrial Compressed Air	199,905	0.02%
PGE2225	Refinery Energy Efficiency Program	341,366	0.03%
PGE2227	Cement Production and Distribution Energ	321,697	0.03%
PGE2228	Industrial Recommissioning Program	303,527	0.03%
PGE2230	Dairy Energy Efficiency Program	129,910	0.01%
PGE2231	Industrial Refrigeration Performance Plu	183,423	0.02%
PGE2232	Light Exchange Program	112,963	0.01%
PGE2233	Wine Industry Efficiency Solutions	123,603	0.01%
PGE2234	Comprehensive Food Process Audit & Resou	162,945	0.01%
PGE2235	Dairy Industry Resource Advantage Pgm	62,613	0.01%
PGE2236	Process Wastewater Treatment EM Pgm for	71,390	0.01%
PGE2240	Builder Energy Code Training	114,903	0.01%
PGE2241	Green Building Technical Support Service	125,925	0.01%
PGE2242	Cool Cash	250,898	0.02%
	Other	2,643	0.00%
Grand Total		63,500,215	5.55%

Exhibit A

Statement of Qualifications of Jeremy Waen

Q1 Mr. Waen, please state your name, position, and address.

A1 My name is Jeremy Waen. I am a Regulatory Analyst at Marin Energy Authority. My business address is 781 Lincoln Avenue, Suite 320, San Rafael, California 94901.

Q2 Please describe your background.

A2 I am a full-time employee for the Marin Energy Authority where I fulfill the role of Regulatory Analyst. I participate in proceedings on MEA's behalf on a wide range of topics that include, among others, greenhouse gas allowances, energy efficiency and cost allocation. I also assist MEA with maintaining regulatory compliance. Prior to working at MEA, I served as an Energy Analyst at the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission ("SFPUC") as part of their Regulatory and Legislative Affairs group within the Department of Power. There I participated in regulatory matters with the CPUC and CARB relating to SFPUC's interests as both an emerging Community Choice Aggregation, and a Publicly Owned Utility. Prior to that, I worked as an advocate for distributed generation of renewable energy with the Clean Coalition. I hold a Masters of Public Administration in Sustainable Management from the Presidio Graduate School, located in San Francisco, California. My resume is attached as Exhibit B.

Q3 What is the purpose of your testimony?

A3 I am sponsoring "Testimony of the Marin Energy Authority on Pacific Gas and Electric Company's Application for 2014 General Rate Case Phase 1."

Q4 Does this conclude your statement of qualifications?

A4 Yes it does.

Exhibit B
Resume of Jeremy Waen

JEREMY WAEN | REGULATORY ANALYST

MARIN ENERGY AUTHORITY | 781 LINCOLN AVE, SUITE 320 | SAN RAFAEL, CA 94901

EXPERIENCE

Regulatory Analyst - *Marin Energy Authority* - San Rafael, CA **January 2012 - Present**
Energy Analyst - *SF Public Utilities Commission* - San Francisco, CA **July 2011 – December 2011**
Volunteer Associate - *Clean Coalition* - Palo Alto, CA **June 2010 - July 2011**
Consultancy Intern - *Collective Invention* - Berkeley, CA **2009 - 2011**
Research Chemist - *Applied Intellectual Capital Labs* - Alameda, CA **2007 - 2009**
Research Assistant - *Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory* - Livermore, CA **Summer 2006**
Research Assistant - *Caltech & NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratories* - Pasadena, CA **Summer 2004**

EDUCATION

MPA in Sustainable Management - *Presidio Graduate School* - San Francisco, CA **May 2011**
BA in Chemistry - *Reed College* - Portland, OR **May 2006**

PRESENTATIONS & EVENTS

Young Professionals in Energy International Summit – *2nd Annual* - Las Vegas, NV **April, 2012**
US Energy Policy Presentation - *School of Renewable Energy Technology* - Phitsanulok, Thailand **January, 2012**
ACS Summer School - *Green Chemistry & Sustainable Energy* - Montreal, Canada **June-July, 2011**
Young Professionals in Energy International Summit - *1st Annual* - Las Vegas, NV **April, 2011**
Workshop: Lifecycle Assessment for Business Leaders - *UC Berkeley* - Berkeley, CA **March, 2011**
United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change COP16 - Cancun, Mexico **December, 2010**

HIGHLIGHTS

POLICY: Monitoring numerous proceedings at CPUC, CEC, & CARB for their impacts on Community Choice Aggregators (CCA). Advocating for fair and equitable CCA regulations through formal comments, protests, & testimony.

COLLABORATION: Coordinating efficient cross-functional team operations. Assessing strengths, promoting collaboration, and optimizing problem-solving for elegant outcomes. Trained in multiple team-building techniques.

ENGAGEMENT: Networking with NGOs, government agencies, industry associations, & activist groups about clean energy policy. Volunteering as event coordinator for San Francisco Bay Area Chapter of Young Professionals in Energy.

STRATEGY: Consulted with local and regional governments: City of Brisbane & Joint Policy Committee. Researched data on jobs and economics related to development of electric vehicles, local renewable power, and energy efficiency.

IMPLEMENTATION: Investigated urban redevelopment of retired naval base in the City of Alameda, CA. Engaged city staff, councils, utilities, businesses, citizens, and impacted tenants to propose alternate sustainable strategies. **SCIENCE:** Researched multiple clean technology topics in both laboratory and literature including flow-cell batteries for grid energy storage, batteries for electric vehicles, and waste remediation. Focused on sustainable green chemistry.

FACILITATION: Supported scenario-planning session on systems thinking and life cycle assessment for US EPA's "Resource Conservation Challenge 2010 Workshop." Interviewed participants, compiled results, and proposed action.

FIELD WORK: Conducted successful 3-man month-long pilot-scale mine tailing remediation in Namibia, Africa. Fostered strong team development despite foreign environment, multinational participants, and hazardous conditions.

JEREMY WAEN

PREPARED TESTIMONY

1. CPUC Application 12-06-002
Opening Testimony of the Marin Energy Authority on Pacific Gas and Electric Company's Application for 2013 Energy Resource Recovery Account and Generation Non-Bypassable Charges Forecast (August 16, 2012)
2. CPUC Application 12-03-001
Testimony of the Marin Energy Authority on Pacific Gas and Electric Company's Application for Approval of Economic Development Rate for 2012-2017 (August 24, 2012)
3. CPUC Application 12-04-020
Testimony of the Marin Energy Authority on Pacific Gas and Electric Company's Application to Establish a Green Option Tariff (October 19, 2012)